DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

Interim Final 2/5/99

RCRA Corrective Action Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA725) Current Human Exposures Under Control

Facility Name: Cemex, Inc. (aka: Southdown, Medusa)
Facility Address: 2001 Portland Park, Wampum, PA 16157

Facility EPA ID #: PAD 08 396 5897

1. Has **all** available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to soil, groundwater, surface water/sediments, and air, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste Management Units (SWMU), Regulated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been **considered** in this EI determination?

X	If yes - check here and continue with #2 below.
	If no - re-evaluate existing data, or
	If data are not available skip to #6 and enter "IN" (more information needed) status code

BACKGROUND

Definition of Environmental Indicators (for the RCRA Corrective Action)

Environmental Indicators (EI) are measures being used by the RCRA Corrective Action program to go beyond programmatic activity measures (e.g., reports received and approved, etc.) to track changes in the quality of the environment. The two EI developed to-date indicate the quality of the environment in relation to current human exposures to contamination and the migration of contaminated groundwater. An EI for non-human (ecological) receptors is intended to be developed in the future.

Definition of "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI

A positive "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI determination ("YE" status code) indicates that there are no "unacceptable" human exposures to "contamination" (i.e., contaminants in concentrations in excess of appropriate risk-based levels) that can be reasonably expected under current land- and groundwater-use conditions (for all "contamination" subject to RCRA corrective action at or from the identified facility (i.e., site-wide)).

Relationship of EI to Final Remedies

While Final remedies remain the long-term objective of the RCRA Corrective Action program the EI are near-term objectives which are currently being used as Program measures for the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, GPRA). The "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI are for reasonably expected human exposures under current land- and groundwater-use conditions ONLY, and do not consider potential future land- or groundwater-use conditions or ecological receptors. The RCRA Corrective Action program's overall mission to protect human health and the environment requires that Final remedies address these issues (i.e., potential future human exposure scenarios, future land and groundwater uses, and ecological receptors).

Duration / Applicability of EI Determinations

EI Determinations status codes should remain in RCRIS national database ONLY as long as they remain true (i.e., RCRIS status codes must be changed when the regulatory authorities become aware of contrary information).

Page 2

2. Are groundwater, soil, surface water, sediments, or air **media** known or reasonably suspected to be "**contaminated**" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, guidance, or criteria) from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action (from SWMUs, RUs or AOCs)?

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	?	Rationale / Key Contaminants
Groundwater			_X		
Air (indoors) ²			_X		
Surface Soil (e.g	(., <2 ft)		_X		
Surface Water			_X		
Sediment			_X_		
Subsurf. Soil (e.	$g_{.,} > 2 \text{ ft}$				
Air (outdoors)	,				
	that these "levels" are not exceeded.				
	If yes (for any media) - continue after identifying key contaminants in each "contaminated" medium, citing appropriate "levels" (or provide an explanation for the determination that the medium could pose an unacceptable risk), and referencing supporting documentation.				
	If unkno	wn (fo	r any me	dia) - skip	to #6 and enter "IN" status code.
.		<i>(</i>)	(1) C		

Rationale and Reference(s): (1) Cemex, Inc. RCRA Partial Closure Certification Report (April, 2001).

(2) 1997 - 2000 On-site Drinking Water Analytical Reports. (There are 4 on-site drinking wells subject

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) drinking water requirements.). (3) 1998 - 2000 NPDES Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) Data. (4) Based on groundwater and soil analytical data, no outdoor air concentrations are known. (5) No indoor air pathways are associated within SWMUs and AOCs. (6) RCRA Facility Assessment Report (June, 1990). (7) Air releases (e.g., kilns) are under state permit. (8) Residents have limited access to surface water and sediment due to the site being secured.

(9) Facility uses EPA approved dust suppressant to minimize the level of dust caused by vehicle traffic. (10) All construction activities which may include contact with soil are addressed by the Facility's OSHA safety procedures.

Footnotes:

¹ "Contamination" and "contaminated" describes media containing contaminants (in any form, NAPL and/or dissolved, vapors, or solids, that are subject to RCRA) in concentrations in excess of appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (for the media, that identify risks within the acceptable risk range).

²Recent evidence (from the Colorado Dept. of Public Health and Environment, and others) suggest that unacceptable indoor air concentrations are more common in structures above groundwater with volatile contaminants than previously believed. This is a rapidly developing field and reviewers are encouraged to look to the latest guidance for the appropriate methods and scale of demonstration necessary to be reasonably certain that indoor air (in structures located above (and adjacent to) groundwater with volatile contaminants) does not present unacceptable risks.

to

Page 3

3. Are there **complete pathways** between "contamination" and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under the current (land- and groundwater-use) conditions?

Summary Exposure Pathway Evaluation Table

Potential **Human Receptors** (Under Current Conditions)

"Contaminated" Media	Residents	Workers	Day-Care	Construction	Trespassers	Recreation	n Food ³
Groundwater	No	No	No	No			No
Air (indoors)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Soil (surface, e.g., <2 ft)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Surface Water	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Sediment	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A
Soil (subsurface e.g., >2 ft)				No			No
Air (outdoors)	No	No	No	No	No		

Instructions for Summary Exposure Pathway Evaluation Table:

- 1. Strike-out specific Media including Human Receptors' spaces for Media which are not "contaminated") as identified in #2 above.
- 2. enter "yes" or "no" for potential "completeness" under each "Contaminated" Media -- Human Receptor combination (Pathway).

Note: In order to focus the evaluation to the most probable combinations some potential "Contaminated" Media - Human Receptor combinations (Pathways) do not have check spaces ("____"). While these combinations may not be probable in most situations they may be possible in some settings and should be added as necessary.

X	If no (pathways are not complete for any contaminated media-receptor combination) - skip to #6, and enter "YE" status code, after explaining and/or referencing condition(s) in-place, whether natural or man-made, preventing a complete exposure pathway from each contaminated medium (e.g., use optional <u>Pathway Evaluation Work Sheet</u> to analyze major pathways).
	If yes (pathways are complete for any "Contaminated" Media - Human Receptor combination) - continue after providing supporting explanation.
	If unknown (for any "Contaminated" Media - Human Receptor combination) - skip to #6 and enter "IN" status code

Rationale and Reference(s): See Page 2.

³ Indirect Pathway/Receptor (e.g., vegetables, fruits, crops, meat and dairy products, fish, shellfish, etc.)

Page 4

Can the exposures from any of the complete pathways identified in #3 be reasonably expected to be " significant " (i.e., potentially "unacceptable" because exposures can be reasonably expected to be: 1) greater in magnitude (intensity, frequency and/or duration) than assumed in the derivation of the acceptable "levels" (used to identify the "contamination"); or 2) the combination of exposure magnitude (perhaps even though low) and contaminant concentrations (which may be substantially above the acceptable "levels") could result in greater than acceptable risks)?						
	If no (exposures can not be reasonably expected to be significant (i.e., potentially "unacceptable") for any complete exposure pathway) - skip to #6 and enter "YE" status code after explaining and/or referencing documentation justifying why the exposures (from each of the complete pathways) to "contamination" (identified in #3) are not expected to be "significant."					
	If yes (exposures could be reasonably expected to be "significant" (i.e., potentially "unacceptable") for any complete exposure pathway) - continue after providing a description (of each potentially "unacceptable" exposure pathway) and explaining and/or referencing documentation justifying why the exposures (from each of the remaining complete pathways) to "contamination" (identified in #3) are not expected to be "significant."					
	If unknown (for any complete pathway) - skip to #6 and enter "IN" status code					
Rationale and Reference(s):						
	"significant" 4 (greater in magni acceptable "leve (perhaps even th acceptable "leve					

⁴ If there is any question on whether the identified exposures are "significant" (i.e., potentially "unacceptable") consult a human health Risk Assessment specialist with appropriate education, training and experience.

Page 5

5.	Can the "signific	rant" exposures (identified in #4) be shown to be within acceptable limits? If yes (all "significant" exposures have been shown to be within acceptable limits) - continue and enter "YE" after summarizing <u>and</u> referencing documentation justifying why all "significant" exposures to "contamination" are within acceptable limits (e.g., a site-specific Human Health Risk Assessment).
		If no (there are current exposures that can be reasonably expected to be "unacceptable")- continue and enter "NO" status code after providing a description of each potentially "unacceptable" exposure.
		If unknown (for any potentially "unacceptable" exposure) - continue and enter "IN" status code
	Rationale and	

Page 6

ent code
ion

X	review of the information contained in the Exposures" are expected to be "Under Comments" are expected	Control" at the Cemex, Inc. (a.k.a.: Southdown, 6 5897, located at Wampum, PA 16157 under ons. This determination will be re-evaluated			
	NO - "Current Human Exposures" are NOT "Under Control."				
	IN - More information is needed to m	ake a determination.			
Completed by	(signature) /Hon Lee (print) Hon Lee (title) Remedial Project Manager	Date: <u>08-09-01</u>			
Supervisor	(signature) /Paul Gotthold (print) Paul Gotthold (title) PA Operations Branch Chief (EPA Region or State) EPA, Region 3	Date: <u>08-09-01</u>			

Locations where References may be found:

US EPA Region III, 3WC22, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103, EPA Administrative Record.

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers:

(name) Hon Lee (phone #) 215-814-3419 (e-mail) lee.hon@epa.gov

FINAL NOTE: THE HUMAN EXPOSURES EI IS A QUALITATIVE SCREENING OF EXPOSURES AND THE DETERMINATIONS WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT SHOULD NOT BE USED AS THE SOLE BASIS FOR RESTRICTING THE SCOPE OF MORE DETAILED (E.G., SITE-SPECIFIC) ASSESSMENTS OF RISK.